

REMARKS

The Examiner's Action mailed on December 15, 2004, has been received and its contents carefully considered.

In this Amendment, Applicant has editorially amended the specification, and made various editorial changes to claims 1, 3 and 6. Moreover, claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of various ones of the claims, including claims 7 and 8, and has further been amended to ensure that this claim complies with all official provisions. Claim 1 is the independent claim, and claims 1, 3 and 6 remain pending in the application. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 under 35 USC Section 112, first paragraph. In particular, it was unclear to the Examiner how the latch section 1111 latches onto the lid 20. The Examiner's Action notes that it appeared from the figures that these members are simply adjacent to each other when the lid is placed thereover. The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to figure 4, which shows the projecting portion of the latch section 1111 being adjacent to the hook structure 21. In this position, the lid is prevented from being slid relative to the base dock. Once the latch section 1111 is moved away from the hook structure 21, as shown in figure 5, the lid can be slid relative to the base dock, as shown in figure 5, to allow the lid and the base dock to be uncoupled. It is

believed that Applicant's amendments to claim 1 clarify these features, and it is further submitted that the claims, as amended, are described in the specification in such a way to enable one skilled in the art to make and use the invention.

Regarding the Examiner's inquiry as to how the lid 20 drives the bucking section 1112, it is noted that the boss 22 projects through the opening formed in the base dock to press against the bucking section 1112. This feature is clearly shown in the drawings, and is described in Applicant's specification. Moreover, regarding the Examiner's contention that there is no hook on hook structure 21, it is noted that a common definition of the term "hook" is --anything that catches--. Thus, the hook need not necessarily be curved shape in order to be defined as a hook. Moreover, it is noted that Applicant's claimed hook structure does abut against the latch section so as to catch thereagainst, which is consistent with the definition of a hook. It is submitted that Applicant's claims comply with all official provisions, and it is thus requested that this rejection be withdrawn.


The Examiner has further rejected claim 8 as being indefinite. Because claim 8 has been canceled, this rejection has been rendered moot. However, in drafting the subject matter of claim 8 into independent claim 1, special care has been taken to ensure that the subject matter has been clarified, so that this claim complies with provisions of 35 USC Section 112, second paragraph.

It is noted with great appreciation that the Examiner's Action has not rejected claims 7 and 8 as being either anticipated by or otherwise rendered obvious in view of the cited references. As such, because independent claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 7 and 8, all of the Examiner's prior art rejections have been rendered moot.

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Such action and the passing of this case to issue are requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert H. Berdo, Jr.
Registration No. 38,075
RABIN & BERDO, PC
Customer No. 23995
Telephone: 202-371-8976
Facsimile: 202-408-0924

March 10, 2005
Date

RHB:vm